

## Navigating Ideological Divergence: Nehru, Bose and Gandhi's Interpose

Adwaita Basu<sup>1</sup>, Chandrima Basu Majumdar<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Student, MA, Department of History, University of Delhi

<sup>2</sup>Scholar, Rabindra Bharati University

### ABSTRACT

The political scenario of India's freedom struggle was shaped by the ideological and strategic differences among its remarkable leaders. Gandhi's emergence as the ideologue for the Congress political party deeply influenced the perspectives of its two most eminent leaders during the British period, namely, Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose. However, despite their relentless struggle to free their motherland from imperial rule, their ideological paths diverged forever due to their fundamental differences in approaches and visions for independent India. Both Nehru and Bose were ardent nationalists, dedicated their life for India's freedom, although their ideologies and concepts to achieve this objective were contrasting. Nehru was deeply influenced by Gandhi's principles of nonviolence and democratic socialism. Nehru envisioned India's future within a parliamentary democratic framework. Bose, in contrast, supported a bold and direct approach, emphasizing direct confrontation with British imperialism. These differences became apparent as Bose's aspirations diverged sharply from Nehru's visions, leading to an inevitable clash that ultimately forced him to walk away from the Congress. A crucial factor that created a division between Nehru and Bose was the role played by Gandhiji. His commitment to non violent and democratic ideology closely aligned with Nehru's vision but contradicted with Bose's radical and revolutionary approaches. The 1939 Tripuri Congress session marked a turning point that brought about a significant change in India's political landscape. While Gandhiji and Nehru stood on one side, Bose took a different path, creating a rift that would never align in the same direction again.

This research paper seeks to explore the ideological contrasts between Nehru and Bose, critically evaluating their differing personalities, visions, and approaches during the freedom struggle. Additionally, it delves into the direct or indirect role of Gandhi in creating an environment that led to the cleft between Nehru and Bose.

**KEY WORDS:** ideological, strategic approaches, influence, rift.

While Mahatma Gandhi was the central figure in India's freedom struggle in British Colonial period, Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhash Chandra Bose also emerged as influential personalities. Both Nehru and Bose inspired the young generation and played a crucial role in shaping the thoughts and aspirations of the Indian people during the time of Indian struggle movement. Apart from Gandhi, it was Nehru and Bose who left a lasting impression on the Indian people during British period. Nehru and Bose entered Indian National movement at the same time. In the year 1920 they started their political journey under the guidance of

Gandhiji in the Non-Cooperation Movement but after the end phase of the movement they played a crucial role in laying the foundation for an alternative path to Gandhism.<sup>1</sup> During this time, Nehru and Bose had a tremendous opportunity to forge a new path and ideology for the freedom struggle, independent of Gandhiji's influence and direction. If this had happened, the history of the Indian struggle for freedom would have been written differently. But unfortunately, the paths of the struggle for Bose and Nehru were entirely different.

Subhas Chandra Bose started his struggle for freedom in 1920 when Gandhiji declared the Non-Cooperation Movement against colonial rule. From the very beginning of his political career, Bose was always impartial in his own opinions and approaches, without any bias towards Gandhiji. The political strategy and approaches adopted by Gandhiji was never doubtlessly accepted by Bose. This is why Bose did not support the ideology of non violence as an integral part for freeing our motherland. In his first meeting with Gandhiji (1921), Bose could easily realize that there was a lack of clarity and realism in his vision, even Gandhiji did not have a pre-planned strategy for the future course of the freedom struggle.<sup>2</sup> Despite this, Bose joined the Non-Cooperation Movement, believing it to be somewhat suitable at the time, because the constitutional process failed and extreme armed revolutionary efforts were also unfruitful. So naturally, a political ideological vacuum emerged in British India, creating an unfavorable environment for Indians. Bose viewed that Non-Cooperation Movement as a progressive step. Bose believed that breaking ties with the British Indian government was essential to undermine the power and confidence of the foreign ruler. Bose conceived the idea after Gandhiji withdrew the movement, seeing it as a disaster setback at a time when people's enthusiasm against the British Indian government was at its peak. A crack in the glass became visible after that. Bose realized that he could not remain under Gandhiji's leadership for long. As a result, Bose joined Swaraj party as a Pro changer, the faction formed by Motilal Nehru and Desh Bandhu Chittaranjan Das to oppose the British India government from within the legislature. Bose realized that India could not achieve independence by following Gandhian philosophy and Satyagraha alone. Instead, he saw the need for an alternative approach that involved creating disorder in the legislature and exerting force to politically paralyze the British colonial government.

From the beginning of Bose's political career, he maintained contact with the revolutionary nationalists in Bengal. He was the editor of the radical paper "Atmashakti", means complete dismantling of foreign rule. But he never showed any support towards the policy of assassination. According to him, the ideology that spread among Indians emphasized love for the nation, national consciousness and promoted unity, rather than extreme violence or killing. In 1924 Bose was arrested due to his close connections with Bengal revolutionary terrorism and his effort to assist Communist leaders like Nalini Gupta and Abani Mukharjee.<sup>3</sup> Even the accusation against Bose that he brought weapons from foreign countries. Bose envisioned a path that fused Gandhian nonviolence with revolutionary spirit, creating a balance between idealism and action without veering in to extremism.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- (1) Why did Nehru and Bose start their political journey at the same direction but later take completely different paths?
- (2) How did Gandhi strategically influence the growing divide between Nehru and Bose?

## METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

This study was totally theoretical based. Data was collected from the major source i.e., The Discovery of India and as secondary source, data was collected from different types of articles, journals written by great scholars and historians.

The direct confrontation between Gandhiji and Bose arose due to differences on their initiation of strategic approaches to protesting against British Indian government. Gandhiji and his followers took the path of consultation with the colonial government regarding the acceptance of the proposal for an Indian Federation as mentioned in the 1935 Act. But Bose was not involved in these negotiations with the British Indian government.

Nehru's vision was completely different from the Bose. From the very beginning of his political journey he was deeply influenced and guided by Gandhiji's ideology. In 1916 Nehru came in to contact with Gandhiji at Lucknow Congress session. Nehru was deeply impressed by Gandhiji because of his movement against racial discrimination and fights for the rights of Indians in South Africa. Even Nehru influenced Gandhiji's ideology of non-violence which was first practiced in South Africa. According to Nehru, Gandhiji firmly believed in the moral values of human being which he called law of love and truth.<sup>4</sup> In India Nehru was also impressed by Gandhi's activities in protesting for the peasant movement at Champaran and by the Kheda Satyagraha in the years 1917 and 1918 respectively. Later Gandhiji tried to establish the ideology of satyagraha to oppose the Rowlatt Act (1919) imposed by the British Indian government. So naturally, Nehru was attracted to the political achievement of Gandhiji and decided to join the Non-Cooperation Movement declared by Gandhiji. He wrote in his Autobiography that he was impressed by the ethical injunction of the Satyagraha ideology but he was not totally faithful towards Nonviolence principle.<sup>5</sup> However, he adopted the ideology of Nonviolence principle because the situation demanded it, as there was no alternative available to challenge the British authority. Everyone thought of SWARAJ in his own way but there was no unity in their thought. Nehru realized the limitations of the Non-Cooperation movement, which could not achieve much for our mother land. However, he continued to follow Gandhiji's path with devotion, even though he was astonished<sup>6</sup> by the aim of the movement. Gandhiji deliberately kept the goal of the movement ambiguous. But the credit of Gandhiji was that he earned the love and trust of the poor and backward sections of the society, who were neglected. According to Nehru, Gandhiji was like the radiant flame of a candle, cutting through the darkness and spreading the brilliance of his principles far and wide. When Gandhiji called off the Non-Cooperation Movement, Nehru was initially surprised by the decision of Gandhiji. However, Nehru realized the negative impact of the violence among Indians particularly in the Chauri Chaura incident in 1922. He understood that violence could achieve nothing for the betterment of our country, and it was opposed to Gandhiji's principle of love and truth. After the breakdown of the movement Nehru aligned himself with the No Changers, whose aim was to boycott of legislative councils of British

Indian government. Nehru was so deeply impressed by Gandhiji's ideology that he distanced himself politically from the ideology of the Pro Changers, which was organized by his father Motilal Nehru. Towards the end of 1920 Nehru and Bose entered Indian politics. Initially, they worked together. But in the year 1927 the Indian political situation was unstable. The death of C.R. Das created a vacuum in the Swaraj party and no significant activities were organized by the Pro Changers. Gandhi and his followers were busy with their constructive work such as promoting Khadi and development of village industries in rural area to encourage self-dependence. On the other side, Subhas felt it was necessary to unite the rural peasant and labour movements with the mainstream of the freedom struggle. During this period, Nehru temporarily changed his views. He represented the conference at Brussels in 1927, aligning himself with the anti-colonial and anti-imperialist movement. There he came in to contact with European Marxism, which influenced him significantly. Nehru explained that the Communist ideology was neither hypocritical nor imperialistic.<sup>7</sup> In the same year, he also attended the 10<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the Soviet Revolution, where he enriched his understanding of radicalism and revolutionary ideology. It was quite surprising that when Nehru left India, he was a devoted follower of Gandhiji. However, upon his return from Soviet Union, his ideology changed significantly. During this time, Bose and Nehru grew closer and shared a bond based on radical ideas. Unfortunately, this bond did not last long. Nehru was unable to fully develop or express his own concepts, values and approach independently due to Gandhiji's strong influence. As a result, the paths of Nehru and Bose eventually diverged in their strategic approaches.

The Congress leaders demanded dominion status or self-government from the British authority in India. However, some younger members of the Congress demanded complete independence. Even Nehru supported the younger generation of Congress leaders. He endorsed the demand of complete independence and raised the proposal in 1927 at the Madras session. Although the proposal was passed, it was not included in the congress constitution.<sup>8</sup> All the non-Congress political party leaders such as revolutionary leaders, communist members and leftists supported the proposal. However, the demand for complete independence was overshadowed by the movement against Simon Commission and by the proposals for the formation of a constitution of colonial government. From the beginning, Gandhiji was not in favor of the demand for complete independence. He even criticized it severely, believing that the time was not appropriate for such a demand and that there was a lack of proper, well-planned program to achieve it. Gandhiji felt that this demand was mainly coming from the younger generation, which is why he referred to it as the Young India movement. He maintained control over the Congress and never allowed support for the leftist demands within the party. He consistently prioritized his own ideology and vision for the party. Whenever any radical extremist demand gained appreciation, he immediately dismissed it. Nehru often retreated from the firmness of Gandhiji. He compromised on his revolutionary and leftist ideology, as he was unwilling to raise his voice against Gandhiji. Nehru consistently negotiated with Gandhiji on matters such decisions against the British, the establishment of ideological frameworks and constitutional rights within the Congress. As a result, a rift was created within the Congress.

The year 1928 and 1929 were vital for the rise of the leftist ideology in India. Nehru became president of the All India Trade Union Congress in 1929 and during the same year he became the president of the Lahore Congress Session. In the Lahore session, Nehru boldly expressed his support for socialism and republicanism. He explained that the philosophy of socialism has gradually spread across the world and that India should adopt this ideology in her own way to eradicate poverty and inequality from our society.<sup>9</sup> During this period Indians demanded complete independence, a call that was largely driven by non-congress leaders. However, Gandhiji did not retreat from his decision for a moderate approach. He realized that if leftism gained too much influence within the Congress, it would become difficult for him to maintain his power and influence over the Congress. As a result, Nehru retreated from his decision for Purna Swaraj due to Gandhiji's firmness. This was also a strategic move to create a division between left and right wings within the Congress.

Ultimately, in 1929 Gandhiji was compelled to raise the demand for complete independence from British rule. The proposal was passed but no concrete program was declared by the Congress to fulfill this demand. Even then Gandhiji was open to negotiations with the British authority.

On the other hand, Bose advocated for setting up a parallel government and promoted dissociating through strikes and boycotts of government offices and institutions. He especially encouraged the youth to unite and form a strong community. Bose realized that the younger generation was the key way to creating military and radical pressure on British authority. But all these efforts were short lived. Bose was not given a position in the Congress committee. Instead of pushing forcefully the goal of complete independence, Gandhiji favored a policy of appeasement and rapprochement with the British Indian government. He became a figure known for avoiding any extreme approach toward British authority.

There was a significant difference in personality between Bose and Nehru. Both were leaders of the Congress and worked under the guidance of Gandhiji. However, Nehru never stopped down from the post of Congress president, which was assigned to him by Gandhiji. He could not openly advocate for leftist ideas because he felt insecure about separating from Gandhiji as well as Congress. Although, Nehru declared himself a supporter of scientific socialism and agreed that socialism is the primary aim of the liberation movement in any country. In contrast, Bose firmly stood for leftist ideologies and he never compromised with Gandhiji when it came to his principles. Bose's political ideology was shaped by a blend of Marxist, Fascist and communist principles, which he skillfully adopted to craft a strategy focused on mass movement and armed resistance against British Indian authority.<sup>10</sup>

Bose emphasized four main ways to gain independence:

- 1) Reduce the payment of taxes.
- 2) Encourage government employees such as Indian military officers, police officers and others to support the sentiments of the people for the freedom of the motherland.
- 3) Ensure the peasants and workers actively participate in the freedom struggle to put pressure on the government.

## 4) All forms of special privileges should be eliminated.

The Civil Disobedience movement could not exert pressure on the British Indian Government. Bose suggested that military and economic blockade were necessary to compel the British leave from India. He emphasized the need for competent leadership and unity among all party leaders. While he held deep respect towards Gandhiji but he believed that freedom would not be achieved under Gandhiji's leadership. Bose realized that the freedom struggle should be organized by workers and all sections of society to strengthen the movement and the political party of the people representing it.

Nehru and Bose had an ideological rift regarding socialism, as they held contrasting views on its concept. Nehru explained that socialism is a philosophy of life and that creating a socialist pattern of society is necessary for parliamentary administration. According to Nehru the aim of socialism is the state control over the production such as land, factories and mines as well as the means of distribution, including railway, banks and more. No one should use these institutions for their personal benefit.<sup>11</sup> Nehru interpret that Marxism is a theory of beneficial for the advancement of society and there is no rigidity, it is a dynamic conception. It also refers to the action and activities through which human life can be transformed.<sup>12</sup> Nehru was much more fascinated by the Marxist statement of socialism. Nehru acknowledged the scientific approach of the Marxist Socialism and he also emphasized the importance of the economic basis of social relations in maintaining a classless society. Nehru's vision about socialism was based on three influences: western liberal impact, Marxism and Gandhian approach.<sup>13</sup> On the other hand, Bose believed in achieving complete independence through militant resistance and self-reliance. Bose emphasized economic emancipation, stating that every person has the right to work, the right to fair wages and equal opportunities<sup>14</sup>. The distribution of wealth should be fair and equitable. According to Bose, society creates equality when there is no class and caste division, where everyone shares the same status and standing. Bose focused on the concept of Samyavada, an idea of Indian Socialism, which emphasized planned industrialization and opposed the Gandhian ideology nonviolence.<sup>15</sup> Once socialism takes over the political system, it begins the process of rebuilding the nation. He emphasized the importance of socialism for economic equality and social justice. Bose has written in his book 'Indian Struggle' believed India needed a political system that was a combination of fascism and communism. But Nehru did not agree with Bose's views. Nehru accepted the ideology of Communism to some extent, but he did not accept the ideology of fascism because Nehru believed in civil liberties, individual rights and democracy. But Fascism promoted authoritarian rule, suppression of individual liberties and glorification of the state over the individual – all of which were fundamentally opposed to the ideology of Nehru's. The approach to socialism was a key point of ideological divergence between Nehru and Subhash Chandra Bose. But both were influenced by the ideas of socialism. Nehru strongly believed in democratic socialism. He also emphasized on mixed economy where public and private sectors both were important. He highlighted social justice and social equality. Bose's ideology on socialism was more radical. He focused on centralized economy with a strong emphasis on state control.

After the decision to withdraw the Civil Disobedience Movement, the left became very dissatisfied. They believed that an alternative to Gandhian politics should be influenced by leftist ideology. As a result, in 1934 the Congress Socialist Party was formed under the direction of Narendradev, Jayprakash Narayan within the Congress. It took the responsibility for leading the future freedom movement against British authority. Before the Lucknow Congress session of 1936, Gandhiji followed the path of constitutional method to protest against British Indian Government, whereas the leftist advocated for a more revolutionary approach. Realizing that he might face increased opposition from the leftist members, Gandhiji once again proposed that Nehru take up the responsibility of the Congress presidency, as he had already done in the year 1929 Lahore session and Nehru accepted the proposal of Gandhiji. Actually Nehru held a deep love and respect for Gandhiji, describing him as greatest revolutionary in Modern Indian history through actions. He believed Gandhiji could not be measured by ordinary standards.<sup>16</sup>

In 1936 Nehru presided over the annual Congress Session at Lucknow. The session was characterized by the rise of leftist ideology, emphasizing the rights of peasants and laborers on one hand and declaiming against the forces of imperialism and fascism on the other hand. Nehru expressed his faith and sentiment towards leftist ideology but most of the major rightist leaders Rajendra Prasad and Patel opposed the leftist sentiments. Socialist ideas were not prominently reflected in the Congress session, largely due the influence of Gandhiji. Ultimately, Nehru retreated from his earlier socialist stance under pressure from the right wing faction within the Congress party. He missed the opportunity to strengthen the freedom movement through radical and leftist forces. Nehru refrained from doing so to avoid a divergence within the Congress, as he was committed to restore the unity of the Congress political party. As a result, Bose wanted a more radical and leftist direction for the national movement, his vision was not realized due to the Gandhiji's political diplomacy. The Lucknow Congress Session marked the rise of the right wing.

The period 1929 to 1939 is significant in modern Indian history for the development of the socialist movement in India after the Great Depression. Several radical organizations were established in India during that time, and peasants and labors spontaneously supported towards socialism ideology. From 1932 onwards Nehru was fascinated towards the ideology of Marxism. In the Lucknow Congress of 1936 Nehru demanded for collective affiliations from the Congress for Kisan Sabha (peasant leagues) and trade unions. At the Lucknow Session, Nehru's presidential address was rich with socialistic ideology and delivered with sharp clarity and purpose.<sup>17</sup> Nehru realized the importance of the peasants and working class joining the mainstream of the freedom struggle movement led by the Congress. Nehru believed that active public support for freedom struggle was essential for achieving independence from foreign rule. In 1936 at Bombay Nehru expressed his deep faith in the ideology of socialism. At that time some industrialists lost their faith and sympathy towards the Gandhian ideology of Satyagraha. Some of the industrialists protested against Gandhian ideology and appealed to Gandhi to solve this issue through radicalism. Gandhiji tackled the matter tactfully and persuaded Nehru to move away from the path of leftism and radicalism.

In 1938 Bose set up a National Planning committee with Jawaharlal Nehru. In the field of planning and industrialization the contribution of both was memorable. The main aim of the planning committee was “raising of the material of the people as a whole”. Subhash and Nehru believed in modern industrialization instead of village cottage small scale industries. But Gandhiji did not accept with the draft plan of industrialization and modern national advancement program prepared by the National planning Committee, which had been set up on the initiative of Subhash Chandra Bose. Once again, Gandhiji tackled the issue with his firm opinion. He never believed that large scale of industrialization was necessary for the advancement of our nation internationally. Gandhiji was strongly opposed to modern industrialization, influenced by the ideas of Tolstoy, as he believed that excessive industrialization took advantage of the working class.<sup>18</sup>

Nehru faced a dilemma when he took over in charge of the Congress President from Bose in 1939. He felt that the Congress leadership never accepted to follow the path of leftism. Nehru realized that very few major Congress leaders supported the leftist ideology, so it would not be easy for the Congress to accept the path of radicalism instead of Gandhian Satyagraha and Nonviolence. Many of the famous leaders of the Congress party shows their respect and gratitude towards Gandhiji even Nehru. Nehru also admitted that Gandhiji’s politics were sometimes very metaphysical and hard to grasp. However, Nehru saw to Gandhiji as man of action, striving to do something for the good and betterment of our society. But at the same time Nehru shows his respect towards Subhash .Nehru wrote that Bose had to face a more difficult situation than anyone else. Nehru wanted to help Bose but he was helpless. This is indicated Nehru’s contradictory attitudes and ambivalent stand.<sup>19</sup> On the one hand, Nehru was reluctant to alienate the rightist leaders, while on the other hand, he felt a sense of sympathy towards leftist ideal and Bose.

Gandhiji and Bose’s differing approaches on the Soviet Union’s revolution led to a key divergence in their opinions to freedom struggle. Bose aimed to establish a socialist ideology in India, but he did not intend to adopt the Soviet model of socialism. His strategy for create a contact with the Soviet Union should be understood in light of the priority he placed on freedom. Bose’s aim was socialist development rooted in the Indian situation. But Subhash acknowledged Soviet Union’s progress and saw it as a potential and beneficial ally for the Indian’s independence struggle. But Gandhiji emphasized the power of moral persuasion and ahimsa to win the hearts of the British authority and force them to grant India independence. But Bose firmly followed the path of the revolutionary method and even considered alliances with international powers, including those influenced by the Soviet model. As a result, a bitter relationship developed between Gandhiji and Bose due to differences in political strategy.

The main confrontation between Gandhiji and Bose arose over the issue of launching a protest movement against British Indian authority. Gandhiji did not want to launch a movement at a time when the Second World war threat was looming near. He and his followers chose the path of negotiating and consulting with the British authorities regarding the selective acceptance of federation as proposed under the British Indian Government Act

of 1935. Bose was unhappy with the existing proposals. Following the Munich Pact in 1938, it was evident that a Second World War was approaching in Europe. Seeing this as an opportunity, Bose exerted direct and radical pressure on the British Indian government. He planned to send an ultimatum to the British Indian authority and began a nationwide campaign to mobilize people for the freedom struggle. However, Gandhiji was displeased with Bose due to his consistent opposition towards federal issue and for issuing an ultimatum to the British Indian government. Nehru maintained an uncertain and unclear position. He realized that disagreeing with Gandhiji would lead to a divergence between rightist and leftists within the Congress. Nehru prioritized maintaining a united Congress and did not permit its division. He repeatedly set aside his own ideology and beliefs out of deep respect and love for Gandhiji and for the sake of maintaining unity within the Congress.

At the Tripuri presidential election in 1939, Bose was strongly opposed both by Gandhi and Nehru.<sup>20</sup> Bose followed more assertive actions against the British Indian government, proposing an ultimatum demanding Swaraj within six months. If the demand was denied, he intended to launch a Civil Disobedience Movement. This confrontational strategy sharply contrasted with Gandhiji's philosophy of non-violence, creating significant tensions within the Congress. The conflict between Nehru and Bose became more pronounced when Nehru supported Govind Ballabh Pant's proposal that the Congress Working Committee should have full faith in Gandhiji's decisions and urging Bose to form working committee as per Gandhiji's political guidance. Nehru expressed his feelings for Gandhiji that he was an extraordinary political leader, and just as every country has its own remarkable leaders who have served their nation with dedication, the people of those countries honor and follow them with respect. Nehru placed his belief and faith in Gandhiji, considering him the only person who capable of freeing our country from foreign rule. It is astonishing that Nehru did not show the same firm belief and faith towards Subhash Chandra Bose. Nehru acknowledged that he was against Bose becoming a president for second time.<sup>21</sup> Nehru realized that ideological divergences between Bose and Gandhiji had caused rifts within the Congress, ultimately weakening the strength of the national movement. He criticized that the leftist faction lacked the strength to lead the movement and stressed the importance of allowing leftist to clear their own path. According to Nehru, Bose and his followers displayed fascist tendencies in their attitudes. The approval of Pant's proposal and agreeing on it indicated that Bose had no opportunity to pursue his own path within the Congress. It became clear after the Tripuri session that neither Gandhiji nor Nehru were open to reconsider Bose's more revolutionary and radical ideological approach. But Bose was a patriotic and noble leader who ready to sacrifices everything for the sake of his motherland. He expressed deep and unconditional love for India, calling it a land beloved by the God. He was born in this land as savior to bring enlightenment for his motherland.<sup>22</sup> As a result, in 1939, Bose broke away from the Congress to establish the Forward Bloc, a revolutionary party rooted in scientific socialism and dedicated to applying class struggle theory in Indian milieu.

The ideological divergence between Nehru and Bose highlights the richness and complexity of India's freedom movement. While both leaders shared a deep commitment to India's independence and envisioned an advanced, large scale of industrialized and socially equitable

modern nation, their visions and approaches often diverged. Nehru believed in democratic socialism, parliamentary institutions, non-violence and international political diplomacy. Bose, though not adverse to socialism, prioritized militant nationalism, assertive actions authoritarian means if required, believing that freedom could not wait upon non progressive, slow reformist way. These approaches reflected not just personal inclinations but differing assessments of national politics, the urgency of freedom from the foreign ruler and role of mass mobilization. The friction between them was not a binary of right versus wrong but a reflection of strategic and ideological pluralism within the broader of the anti-imperialism struggle in our nation. Their commitment towards national struggle, social justice and secularism place them firmly within the India's great visionary leaders while their disagreement sparked an ideological debate that helped shape a multifaceted freedom struggle. The ethical, political and strategic dilemmas faced by Indian leaders marked a pivotal moment in Indian history.

A critical assessment of Gandhiji's role in the rift between Nehru and Bose reveals that, while he may not have overtly engineered their divergence, his ideological rigidity and strategic favouritism particularly towards Nehru, played a decisive role deepening the divide between the two nationalist figures. The relationship between Gandhiji and Bose was based on truthfulness, transparency, sacrifice and dedicated their life for motherland.<sup>23</sup> In spite all of these, there were glaring differences between them and political approaches both were posed against each other. Gandhiji's deep affection to non-violence, Satyagraha and his vision of ethically driven freedom struggle of mass movement contrasted sharply with Bose's growing inclination toward militarized resistance, leftist authoritarianism and international alliances. While Nehru shared several socialist and modern industrialist ideas with Bose, his proximity to Gandhiji and readiness to align with Gandhiji's broader vision, positioned him more favorable and secured within the Congress political party. Bose observed that while Nehru's mind aligned with the leftists, but his heart, emotions always remained with Gandhiji.<sup>24</sup> Gandhiji's tacit support towards Nehru as his political successor, combined with his open criticism of Bose's ultimatum strategy at Tripuri Congress in 1939, shifted the balance of power and ultimately sidelined Bose, despite his legitimate election as Congress president. This highlights a striking paradox: Gandhiji was an apostle of democratic values and moral politics but he did not fully maintained internal democracy within the Congress party when Bose's ideology conflicted with his own. Therefore, the rupture between Nehru and Bose cannot be understood only by the vision of ideology and approaches but must be viewed through the prism of Gandhiji's decisive influence, although Gandhiji was often praised for his rigid moral leadership but in reality, Bose's departure from the Congress was a result of political diplomacy orchestrated by Gandhiji. Bose's victory as the president reflected the people's growing trust in a new direction of leadership within the Congress and peoples have lost their faith in Gandhian policies.<sup>25</sup> While leading the freedom movement, Gandhiji unintentionally caused divisions by focusing more on everyone following the same ideology which was proposed by Gandhiji himself. To adhere to the same ideology proposed by Gandhiji was not feasible for all Congress party workers during the time of the freedom struggle. Gandhiji, despite a being a proponent of liberalism and democracy, displayed an autocratic stance in his treatment towards Bose during the Tripuri Congress. Ultimately, on

1939, 29<sup>th</sup> April Bose resigned from the Congress and formed a radical party bringing the entire left wing under one banner Forward Bloc.<sup>26</sup> If Gandhiji have agreed Bose's to issue an ultimatum to the British Indian Government, the history of India might have taken a different course – one that was more radical, militant and assertive. It would also have demonstrated how both leftist and rightist could coexist under the broad umbrella of the Indian National Congress.

The discussion raises question about what would have happened if Nehru and Bose had worked together for Indian freedom struggle while Gandhiji was sidelined. What if Bose had not resigned from the Congress? Could a sustained collaboration between Nehru and Bose have altered the course of the Indian freedom struggle?

If Nehru and Bose had worked closely and united their strengths, then the history of India's freedom struggle could have been written in another way. Both were empowered leaders who loved their country deeply and wanted to see it free from the British authority. Both leaders represented contrasting ideology and approaches – Nehru's belief in democratic socialism and parliamentary administration, on the other side Bose's faith on revolutionary and openness to military action against British authority. Yet, their combined leadership might have dramatically altered the course of the freedom struggle. Nehru's global diplomacy integrated with Bose's radical vision could have created a more powerful multipronged resistance to British authority. Bose's attempt to seek help from the Axis Powers through the Indian National Army or INA combined with Nehru's socialist democratic ideals and international institutions might have placed exerted pressure on Indian British Union. This fusion of force and political diplomacy might have enabled India to achieve independence more quickly. Another potential advantage of these bonds was that they brought moderate and radical leftist together under the Congress. It might be a broad example of Indians showing political unity against the British Indian government. Furthermore, their ideological integration might have established the groundwork for a more powerful model of governance in democratic India combining Bose's commitment towards modern economic thought and social equality with Nehru's vision for democratic socialism and planned economic development.

## References:

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Gaur Chandra Ghosh and Abhijit Dutta, *Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhash Chandra Bose ; A comparative study of ideology and its application in the perspective of Freedom Movement*. Karatoya NBU J . Hist. vol.9 . p- 23

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p- 24

<sup>3</sup> Tarapada Lahiri , *The eventful decade , 1920 – 1929* ,p- 232

<sup>4</sup> Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, Oxford university Press , P- 362

<sup>5</sup> Dr. Gaur Chandra Ghosh and Abhijit dutta , *Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhash Chandra Bose ; A comperative study of ideology and its application in the perspective of Freedom Movement*. Karatoya NBU j . Hist. Vol 9 .

- <sup>6</sup> Jawaharlal Nehru , Discovery of India, Calcutta 1947 , p- 299 .
- <sup>7</sup> Jawaharlal Nehru ; An autobiography. P- 163.
- <sup>8</sup> Dr. Gaur Chandra Ghosh and Abhijit Dutta ; Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhash Chandra Bose; A comparative study of ideology and its application in the perspective of the Freedom Movement. Karatoya; NBU J, Hist.Vol 9. P- 27.
- <sup>9</sup> Jawaharlal Nehru ; India's freedom , London, 1962 , P-14
- <sup>10</sup> Ankit Tiwari, Subhash Chandra Bose ; An Analysis of his contribution in the Indian Freedom struggle and its contemporary relevance. ACADEMICIA ; An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal , Vol 15, P- 3.
- <sup>11</sup> Jawaharlal Nehru , Glimpses of World History , Oxford University Press, 1934, P- 543 .
- <sup>12</sup> Ibid; p- 544.
- <sup>13</sup> Dr. Anand kumar, Nehru's concept and Ideas on Socialism, The expression; An International Multidisciplinary e- journal; Vol- 3 , Issue 6, Dec. 2017.
- <sup>14</sup> Hari Mohon Sharma, Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose's Economic and political vision for independent India. Himachal Pradesh University Journal( Humanities and Social Sciences), Vol- 10 , June 2022.
- <sup>15</sup> Miguel Ohnesorge, Global Concepts and Semantics of Social Spaces: Fascism and National Socialism in the Political Language of the Subhash Chandra Bose. Global History , A student journal, Vol- 4 , No- 1, May 2018, P- 114.
- <sup>16</sup> Article entitled 'Jawaharlal Nehru ; An Enigma or an tragedy?' By M.N . Roy in A.B. Shah's book " Jawaharlal Nehru ; A critical tribute " , P. C. Manaktala and sons Private Ltd; Bombay – 1, 1965, P- 365
- <sup>17</sup> R.P. Dubey. Jawaharlal Nehru , A Study in ideology and social Chang. Mittal Publications, P- 4 .
- <sup>18</sup> D.M. Nachane, Gandhinian Economic Thought and its Influence on Economic Policymaking in India. P- 18.
- <sup>19</sup> S. Gopal , Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru, Vol VIII, 1976, P- 516
- <sup>20</sup> Siddhartha Dash, Gandhi and Subash Chandra Bose, Orissa review, January, 2005.
- <sup>21</sup> Dr. Ajay Krishna Tiwari, Indian National Political Thought Of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose. International Journal of Transformation in English and Education. Vol-8 , Issue 1- 2023 , P- 14.
- <sup>22</sup> Hari Mohon Sharma, Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose's Economic and political Vision for Independent India. Vol- 10 , No- 2, June 2022, P- 6.
- <sup>23</sup> Siddhartha Dash, Gandhi and Subhash Chandra Bose, Orissa Review, January ,2005, P- 14.
- <sup>24</sup> Satyabrata Rai Chowdhury; Leftist Movements in India: 1917 47, South Asia Books, 1976, P- 162
- <sup>25</sup> Asutosh Lahiri, Gandhi in Indian Politics: A critical Review. Firma KlmPvt Ltd , Calcutta, 1976, P- 83.
- <sup>26</sup> Siddhartha Dash, Gandhi and Subhash Chandra Bose, Orissa review, January, 2005. P- 13.